UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/435,377	05/05/95	CLERON M	P1525/112007

LM02/0105

CESARI AND MCKENNA
30 ROWES WHARF
BOSTON MA 02110

EXAMINER	
CALDWELL,P	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2755	30

DATE MAILED: 01/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/435,377	Applicant(s) CLERON ET AL.	
	Examiner Pat Caldwell	Art Unit 2755	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 October 1999* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:

1.☐ received.

2.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____ .

3.☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

14) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
15) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
19) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to CPA that was filed 10/27/99. Claims1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. §1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. §102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Duggan et al (US 5 584 035) in view of Anderson et al (US 5537526)

As per independent **claim 1**, Duggan et al disclose the invention as claimed :

Duggan et al disclose an extensible and replaceable layered component computing arrangement for providing services directed to information available on computer networks (distributed object based system), operating system (12) [column 4, line 43 through column 5, line 2].

Duggan et al disclose a software component architecture layer (object software 24 in which objects are contained and the the contained information can be comprised of various formats, including text and images) coupled to an operating system and defining a plurality of computing components (container objects) [column 5, line 25 through column 6, line 4].

However, Duggan et al do not explicitly teach a network component layer for creating network navigation components configured to search and obtain information available on computer networks.

Anderson et al teach network navigation components configured to search and obtain information on the computer networks (suite of OpenDoc components with networking and communications capabilities including Internet browsing tools) [first page of enclosed copy of article].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Duggan et al to include the retrieval functions as taught by Anderson to enable users to locate information locally and remotely and to embed this information directly into documents.

As per **claim 2**, Duggan et al do not explicitly disclose an computing arrangement wherein the network navigation components are objects and the network component layer comprises application programming interfaces delivered in the form of objects in a class hierarchy.

Anderson discloses an environment wherein the network navigation components are objects and the network component layer comprises application programming interfaces in a class hierarchy (user interfaces based upon a model hierarchy) [col. 8].
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify the system as taught by Duggan et al by implementing the application programming interfaces that are delivered in the form of objects in a class hierarchy because it would provide the system of Duggan et al with an improved capability of an interface for network communications.

As per **claim 3**, Duggan et al as modified by Anderson teach an application programming interface which includes a first class (frameworks for communication between documents [Anderson : cols. 17-19]].

As per **claim 4**, Duggan et al as modified by Anderson teach an application programming interface which includes a second class (framework for client-server interface) [Anderson :cols. 18-20].

As per **claim 5**, Duggan et al as modified by Anderson teach a means for spawning the

stream object (linking) [Duggan : column 8, line 50 through column 10, line 12].

As per **claim 7**:

Refer to claim 1 for rejection and combination of references. Additionally, Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a processor [Duggan: col. 12, line 20-21].

As per **claim 8**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a means for embedding components having mixed data types and formats (accessing data embedded within various models) [Anderson : col. 4, line 11-61; col. 8, line 45-51].

As per **claim 9**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach application programming interfaces (windows interface software 14, windows software 22) [Duggan : column 4, lines 62-63; column 5, lines 21-24].

As per **claim 10**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach means for constructing a network navigation component (object, icons) representing a resource available on the computer network [Duggan : column 5, lines 25-65; column 7, lines 3-7; column 11, lines 19-40].

As per **claim 11**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach network navigation component that

implements a protocol (protocols for accessing data embedded with object) [Anderson : col. 4, line 11-61; col. 9, line 8-22].

As per **claim 12**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach network navigation components providing additional functionalities (supports seamless integration of various components which may be alien to each other [Anderson : col. 8, line 45-52].

As per **claim 13**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a computing part having a viewing editor and data content (windows) [Duggan : column 6, line 23 through column 7, line 2].

As per **claim 14**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach transferring files over networks (transferring remote information into a document) [Anderson: cols. 18-19].

As per **claim 15**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a browsing component (linking mechanism) [Anderson: col. 4]

As per **claim 17**:

Duggan et al disclose controlling operations of a computer system with a operating system coupled to a software component architecture layer (object software 24) [column 5, line 25 through column column 6, line 4].

However, Duggan et al do not explicitly teach a network component layer for creating network navigation components configured and providing a network service.

Anderson discloses network component layer for creating a plurality of components and invoking a component to provide network service (frameworks for locally and remotely transferring data) [Anderson : cols. 17-20].
It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Duggan et al to include the retrieval functions as taught by Anderson to enable users to access information from various locations across a network.

As per **claim 18**:
Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach extending navigation components (linking from one resource to another) [Anderson : col. 4].

As per **claim 19**:
Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach browsing [linking and retrieval of information from external documents) [Anderson : cols. 4, 18]

As per **claim 20**:
Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a platform for developing components for operation on a variety of hardware and software computer systems (framework for extending attributes to other models) [Anderson : cols. 8, 10].

As per claim 6:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach a third class which can construct an network navigation object (links) representing additional behaviors provided to computer components [Anderson : cols. 4, 10].

As per **claim 16**:

Duggan et al in combination with Anderson teach displaying text [Duggan : Figures 28 and 29] and displaying movies (video) [Anderson : col. 8].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Monnard et al teach object-oriented linking of various platforms. Helm et al teach object-oriented browsing and retrieval. Jalalian (US 5548722) teach a user-centric approach for network functions. Nguyen (US 5481666) teach object-oriented navigation and embedding. Curbow et al (US 5669005) teach embedding information within containers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pat Caldwell whose telephone number is 703-305-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEXTIME.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on 703-305-9716. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-9051 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

PC
December 30, 1999.

ALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700